

Faculty Satisfaction Survey 1998-99 and 2000-01

I. Introduction

In a continuous effort to assess University effectiveness Faculty were surveyed in the Spring of 2001. This survey represents the third consecutive year in which responses were solicited from the Faculty on their level of satisfaction with University services and processes. Specifically, the survey solicited perceptions on such activities as budgeting, communication processes, planning, and policy formation. In addition to perceptions in these areas, demographic information, involvement with Faculty governance, and information related to the use of technology was also obtained.

In an effort to increase our understanding of potential trends that may be emerging among the Faculty, results are compared to the Faculty surveys conducted in 1998-99 and 1999-00. By doing so, we not only increase our understanding of University processes, but we are also in a better position to identify areas of increased and/or decreased effectiveness.

The report begins with a comparison of the sample characteristics of Faculty during the three survey periods. This information provides us with some understanding of the representativeness of our sample relative to the general Faculty population. This assessment is then followed by an analysis of the perceptions of Faculty regarding general University processes and services. The report then turns to a presentation of information on Faculty activities such as involvement in University governance and the use of technology. The report concludes by summarizing our findings, with special attention given to relevant trends that appear to be emerging.

II. Survey Sample Characteristics

Information presented in Table 1 compares our survey sample to the general University Faculty. Note that, in general, the sample tends to approximate the distribution of University Faculty as a whole. However, Faculty with the rank of Professor and those with tenure tend to be more prevalent in the sample than in the general University population. On the other hand, the distributions noted in the 2000-01 sample are somewhat consistent with the survey samples from 1998-99 and 1999-00.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics

	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01	
	<u>Percent Sample</u>	<u>Percent Population</u>	<u>Percent Sample</u>	<u>Percent Population</u>	<u>Percent Sample</u>	<u>Percent Population</u>
Gender:						
Male	53.7	52.7	62.9	57.1	56.8	55.0
Female	38.2	37.2	36.4	42.9	41.5	45.5
Unknown	8.1	10.1	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.0
Total N	123	387	132	385	183	384
Current Rank:						
Prof	27.6	22.5	27.3	22.3	29.5	19.5
Assoc Prof	30.1	25.8	30.3	24.2	27.9	17.7
Asst Prof	23.6	19.6	22.7	17.9	17.5	15.6
Other	18.7	22.1	19.6	35.6	25.1	47.1
Total N	123	387	132	385	183	384
Tenure Status:						
Tenure	54.5	51.7	51.5	51.7	52.5	42.9
On Track	10.6	9.6	11.4	7.8	14.8	11.2
Non Track	34.9	38.8	37.1	40.5	32.7	45.8
Total N	123	387	132	385	183	384

In examining the samples in detail, we found that in the previous two survey years, only about one-third of the total Faculty pool responded to our survey. In 2000-01 this percentage increased to just under 48 percent. As indicated above, the characteristics of these samples were relatively similar over the years, with males continuing to respond at a higher rate than females. It should be noted, however, that this higher response rate for males is consistent with the distribution of the Faculty as a whole. In fact, the 2000-01 distribution was considerably more representative of the total Faculty pool than was the distribution noted in 1999-00 in regards to the gender distribution.

Table 2
Other Sample Characteristics

	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
Years Teaching Experience:			
Greater than 20	52.9	42.1	40.9
11 to 20	18.7	22.8	26.5
6 to 10	18.7	22.7	21.5
5 or Less	9.7	12.9	11.0
Total N	123	132	183
Service at TSU:			
Greater than 20	45.6	34.3	32.8
11 to 20	15.4	25.1	28.9
6 to 10	23.6	21.3	18.9
5 or Less	15.4	19.7	19.4
Total N	123	132	183
Percent Indicating:			
Graduate Faculty Status	52.8	56.8	61.8
Full-time Faculty Status	94.3	94.7	95.1

We also noted that the characteristics of our 2000-01 sample for academic rank and tenure status were slightly skewed toward the upper levels of these status indicators. Specifically, about three-fourths held the rank of assistant professor or higher compared to only 53 percent in the general Faculty population. Although this result tends to indicate a rather substantial difference, the current sample was considerably less skewed than the samples of the previous two years.

This was not the case for tenure status. In 1998-99 and 1999-00 the percent of those with tenure was approximately the same as the percentage found in the general population. In 2000-01, approximately 53 percent reported that they had tenure compared to only 43 percent in the total Faculty pool.

Thus, even more so than in the previous two survey years, it appears, based on these particular status indicators (i.e., rank and tenure), that our samples are composed primarily of those Faculty that have been affiliated with the teaching profession and possibly Texas Southern University for some period of time. Those not represented in our samples are more than likely part-time Faculty and those that are not normally considered members of the University Professorate. This exclusion is not overly problematic in that those included are normally thought of as the most influential representatives of the population of Faculty members.

Table 2 tends to support our assumptions. When asked about years of teaching experience and service to Texas Southern University, over two-thirds of the 2001-01 sample had over ten years of teaching experience. This is compared to 72 percent in 1998-99 and 65 percent in 1999-00. Likewise, 62 percent of the respondents in 2000-01

reported having been affiliated with Texas Southern University for more than ten years compared to 61 percent in 1998-99 and 59 percent in 1999-00.

We can discern from this that the respondents, in all years considered, represented Faculty members that should be knowledgeable of the Texas Southern University environment and should express perceptions and opinions related to the normal Faculty experience found at the University. Similarly, they do not represent the perceptions of the transient Faculty member in that approximately 95 percent in all years were full-time Faculty (Table 2). Accordingly, their responses should provide us with a fairly reasonable assessment of the normal everyday Faculty circumstance.

III. Perceptions of University Processes and Services

In all three years Faculty were asked a battery of questions relating to university processes and services. For purposes of this analysis, these questions have been divided into two basic categories--those that address university processes and those that address university services and resources. The questions relating to processes solicited perceptions on budgeting, university communication, and planning and policy formation. Questions related to services and resources assessed the degree to which Faculty were satisfied with selected services provided by the university.

Processes

As Table 3 indicates there have been noticeable changes in the Faculty's perception of university processes over the three years examined. Specifically, perceptions relating to the budgeting process being enrollment driven have decreased and then increased over the three year period. In 1998-99 just under three-fourths of the

Faculty (74 percent) indicated that the budgeting process was enrollment driven. This percentage decreased to 64 percent in 1999-00 and then increased to approximately 69 percent in 2000-01. On the other hand, slightly more Faculty thought that budget allocations were adequate in 2000-01 than in the previous two years. However, the percentage indicating adequate budget allocations was only 12, which was nonetheless up from 6 percent in the previous two years.

Table 3
Perceptions of General University Processes

	Percent Indicating Yes		
	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
Budgeting:			
Budget Function Enrollment Driven	74.0	63.6	68.8
Budget Allocations Adequate	6.5	6.1	11.9
Communication:			
Faculty Informed About Major Issues	30.1	39.4	44.6
Consistently Informed About Institutional Policy	22.8	39.4	46.9
Familiarity with President's Vision ¹	55.3	40.9	68.8
Planning and Policy Formation:			
Planning Process Encourages Participation	53.7	60.6	56.4
Faculty Input Important at Board Level	57.7	60.6	48.0
Faculty Input Important at Executive Level	65.0	68.9	62.5
Faculty Input Important at Provost/Dean Level	67.5	69.7	69.7
Faculty Input Important at Departmental Level	84.6	89.4	85.5
Faculty Assembly Influential In Institutional Policy	34.1	49.2	52.0

¹ Response categories were different for this item. The question asked "how familiar are you with the President's Vision". In 1998-99 it was the "Urban Academic Village", while in 1999-00 it was the "Five Vision Points". The response categories were: very familiar, familiar, and unfamiliar. Percents reported here represent the combined responses to "very familiar" and "familiar".

There were also substantial changes in the perceptions of Faculty regarding university communication. In fact, the results tend to imply an upward trend in communication around the University. Specifically, Faculty in 2000-01 felt that they were more informed about major university issues (45 percent) and that they were consistently informed about institutional policy (47 percent). These 2000-01 percentage levels indicate a consistent rise in the Faculty's perception of being informed about University issues over the past two years.

Similarly, Faculty in 1999-00 were less familiar with the President's Vision for the University than they were in 1998-99. However, just under 69 percent indicated that they were familiar with this Vision in 2000-01. This rather substantial change adds credibility to the assertion that communication throughout the University has substantially increased.

Unlike the area of communication, positive perceptions of planning and policy formation seem to be decreasing. In 1999-00 all six items relating to planning and policy formation exhibited increases in positive perceptions. In 2000-01, four of the six items exhibited a decrease. Fewer Faculty in 2000-01 believe that the planning process encourages participation and fewer believe that their input is important at the Board level and at the Executive level.

It should be noted, however, that these decreases only appear to be substantial in one area, input at the Board level. For this item, the percent of Faculty indicating that their input was important decreased from 61 percent to 48 percent. For the other three items the decrease was never more than 7 percentage points, being 4.2 percentage points for the planning process encouraging participation, 6.4 percentage points for the

importance of input at the Executive level, and 3.9 percentage points for the importance of input at the departmental level. It was also interesting to note that there was no change in the perception of input at the Provost and Deans level, with a perceived increase in the influence of the Faculty Assembly regarding institutional policy.

Based on these results, it appears that although in 1999-00 Faculty were beginning to feel more comfortable with the financial situation of the university in that they believed that budgeting was affected by factors other than enrollment, in 2000-01 they seem to be moving back toward the perception that the University's budget revolves almost exclusively around enrollment. On the other hand, they felt that communication channels were very open, even more so than in the previous year, and that they are well informed about major issues around the University.

Regarding planning and policy formation the results were less positive. Of the six items examined four exhibited decreases in the percentage of Faculty holding positive perceptions. One can speculate from this that the Faculty may be becoming less optimistic about their role in the planning and policy formation process of the University.

Services

When satisfaction with university services and resources were considered, it was noted that the top ten rankings remained remarkably consistent over the three year period. As Table 4 indicates, the top ten services and resources in 2000-01 were exactly the same top ten that were noted in 1998-99.

Although the top four rankings did not substantially change between 2000-01 and 1999-00 there were some interesting shifts between positions five and ten. Specifically, library resources moved from the ninth position to the seventh position and admissions

moved from the eighth position to the sixth position. Registration, on the other hand, moved from the sixth position to the ninth position, which was similar to its ranking in 1998-99.

Table 4
Ranking of Services and Resources
Provided by the University ^{1,2}

	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01	
	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent Satisfied</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent Satisfied</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent Satisfied</u>
Department Administration	1	58.2	1	63.8	1	61.1
Department Curriculum Planning	2	54.2	2	58.9	4	52.5
Library Services	3	52.1	2	54.2	2	53.6
School/College Administration	4	44.3	4	51.9	3	54.5
Library Resources	5	37.2	9	30.2	7	35.0
Admissions	6	22.9	8	25.2	6	31.5
Central Administration	7	24.6	5	47.2	5	41.9
Records Maintenance	8	20.9	7	30.6	8	29.1
Registration	9	24.3	6	40.0	9	33.1
Recruitment	10	14.3	12	7.6	10	21.7
Maintenance Buildings/Grounds	11	19.0	10	21.2	11	37.1
Maintenance of Classrooms/Labs	12	19.5	11	18.9	12	31.0
Availability of Technology	12	17.4	13	13.8	13	19.8

¹ Ranks are based on a weighted average of responses for each item. Weights were assigned as follows: 1=very satisfied, 2=satisfied, 3=neutral, 4=dissatisfied, and 5=very dissatisfied.

² Percent Satisfied is the combined total of those that indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the service or resource.

Thus, it appears that the 2000-01 rankings are moving more toward the 1998-99 rankings than was the case in 1999-00. In fact, of the 13 services and resources considered, only 4 exhibited a decrease in the percent of Faculty satisfied between 1998-

99 and 1999-00 (i.e., Library Resources, Recruitment, Maintenance of Classrooms and Labs, and Availability of Technology). In 2000-01, a total of six services and resources exhibited decreases in satisfaction (i.e., Departmental Administration, Departmental Curriculum Planning, Library Services, Central Administration, Records Maintenance, and Registration). On a positive note, however, of the 4 that exhibited decreases between 1998-99 and 1999-00, all exhibited increases between 1999-00 and 2000-01.

IV. Faculty Involvement and Use of Technology

In this section we focus on various Faculty activities. Specifically, attention is directed toward Faculty involvement in University governance activities and their use of technology.

Table 5
Involvement with Faculty Governance

	Percent Indicating Yes ¹		
	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
Presently Active with Faculty Assembly	30.1	38.6	33.1
Ever Participated with Faculty Assembly	67.5	72.7	66.2
Voted in Last Election	70.7	52.3	53.5
Participated in Selection of Faculty Council Representative	80.5	78.0	72.9
Ever Attended a Regents Meeting	47.2	52.3	49.0

¹ Total N for 1998-99 is 123. The Total N for 1999-00 is 132. The Total N for 2000-01 is 183.

Table 5 presents the results of our analysis related to Faculty involvement with governance activities. We find that there were only slight changes between 1999-00 and 2000-01. However, most of those changes were in the direction of less involvement. Fewer Faculty indicated that they were involved with the Faculty Assembly and fewer are attending Board of Regents meetings. Specifically, 33 percent compared to 39 percent in 1999-00 indicated that they were presently active with the Faculty Assembly and 49 percent compared to 52 percent in 1999-00 indicated that they had attended a Board of Regents meeting.

These results imply decreased levels of participation on the part of Faculty. This conclusion is supported in part by the responses to the items that asked if they ever participated with the Faculty Assembly and if they participated in the election of their Faculty Council Representative. Even though the level of participation remains high in 2000-01 (66 percent for participating with the Assembly and 73 percent for selection of Faculty Council Representative) there was a decrease in participation between this year (i.e., 2000-01) and 1999-00.

Perhaps the most significant change in Faculty activity over the past year has been in the area of technology. As Table 6 indicates, in almost every area considered there has been a rather substantial increase in usage. In 2000-01 just under 88 percent of the Faculty indicated that they had access to the Internet in their office. This is compared to only 56 percent in 1999-00 and 48 percent in 1998-99. Similarly, almost all respondents (97 percent) indicated that they had a computer in their office. This is compared to approximately 79 percent in both 1999-00 and 1998-99.

Faculty also indicated that they were using PCs as teaching aids and using CD-ROM databases to a greater extent in 2000-01 than they were in the previous two years. It is also interesting to note that Faculty are using fairly new equipment. Over 80 percent reported that their computers were less than three years old.

Table 6
Faculty Use of Technology

	Percent Indicating		
	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
Access to Internet in Office	48.0	56.1	87.7
Total N	123	132	179
PC in Office	78.9	79.5	97.1
Total N	123	132	175
Age of PC:			
Less than one year	34.4	20.4	24.1
More than one but less than 3	32.3	35.2	57.8
More than 3 but less than 5	18.8	23.1	15.1
More than 5	14.6	21.3	3.0
Total N	96	108	166
Use PC as Teaching Aid	69.1	72.0	74.3
Total N	123	132	183
Use Library CD-ROM database	33.1	20.5	26.8
Total N	123	132	183

V. Summary

Our analysis has revealed a slight reversal in some of the positive trends noted in the previous year's survey. Specifically, historical perceptions of an enrollment driven budgeting process are beginning to emerge again along with the perception that Faculty input in the planning and policy formation process is not important. On the other hand,

there was a clear indication that the Faculty thought the lines of communication within the University were much improved over their levels in 1999-00 and 1998-99.

Similarly, it was also noted that satisfaction levels with University services and resources in historically problematic areas were also beginning to decrease. Although not substantial at this point, the fact that so many of the services and resources (6 of 13) exhibited decreases is a cause for concern. This is especially the case when one notes that only four exhibited a decrease in 1999-00 compared to six in 2000-01 and the fact that they were six different services and resources in the 2000-01 survey year.

Also of significance is the apparent decrease in involvement with Faculty governance. For each area considered, the Faculty reported being less involved in 2000-01. The exception was in regards to the percent that voted in the last election. However, this number only represented just over half of the responding Faculty.

The most positive finding noted in this year's survey was the Faculty usage of technology. Almost all Faculty (97 percent) reported having a PC in their office, with 88 percent reporting Internet access. This represents a dramatic shift in the University's ability to function effectively in a technologically advanced University community.